

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by Examiners Tugbang and Nguyen during the telephonic interview on December 12, 2007. During that interview, Applicant's undersigned representative discussed proposed claim amendments (which are presented in this Amendment) and discussed how they distinguished over Hashimoto (USPN: 5,724,722).

Claims 1-7 were previously canceled.

Claims 8 and 20 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 8-20 are still pending in this application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office has rejected claims 8-13 and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (USPN: 5,724,722).

Independent claim 8, as amended, recites a component placement device comprising, among other things, an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device, and at least one substrate support that is situated along a longitudinal side of the transport device and that faces away from a component feeder, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport direction.

Independent claim 20, as amended, recites a component placement device comprising, among other things, an elongated transport device that is configured to transport a substrate in a transport direction parallel to the transport device, and at least one substrate support that is situated along a longitudinal side of the transport device on an opposite side of the transport device from the component feeder, the at least one substrate support having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device.

As explained in Applicant's specification, the recited substrate support (situated along a longitudinal side of the transport device and having a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device) permits embodiments of the component placement device to be constructed that can handle large or oversized substrates.

Applicant respectfully submits that Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest the recited component placement devices of claims 8 and 20 having a substrate support that is situated along a longitudinal side of the transport device and that has a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device.

Hashimoto discloses a conveyor section 13. Assuming, arguendo, that the conveyor section 13 constitutes a transport device, Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest a substrate support that is situated along a longitudinal side of the transport device and that has a longitudinal direction that extends perpendicular to the transport device. Hashimoto simply has no such substrate support.

Accordingly, since Hashimoto does not disclose each and every limitation of independent claim 8 or independent claim 20, Hashimoto does not anticipate that which is claimed in the present application under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 9-19 depend from independent claim 8 and therefore also are patentable over Hashimoto. (see 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4)

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office has rejected claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Togami, et al (USPN: 5,855,059).

Claims 14 and 15 depend from independent claim 8. Independent claim 8 is patentable over Hashimoto for at least the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, claims 14 and 15 are also patentable over Hashimoto (see 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶4). Togami, et al does not teach that which is missing in Hashimoto. Therefore claims 14 and 15 are patentable over any reasonable combination of Hashimoto and Togami, et al. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of claims 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.


The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 18, 2007

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 672-5439  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

Andrew E. Rawlins  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,702